REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated February 14, 2008. Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 1-8, 10-11 stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Claim 9 has been allowed.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claim 9.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 10, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner argued that the limitation "print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon" was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Fig. 1A of the present application depicts a display screen 1, a print icon 11, and an icon representing a manuscript file as a file icon 12, as well as a pointer 2 (lines 11-16, p. 10). The icons representing the printer and the manuscript file to be printed are clearly <u>not in any contact</u>. Furthermore, the print icon has a display of print conditions <u>on the icon itself</u>. More specifically, as can be seen in Fig. 8, various printing conditions, e.g., number of copies, stapling operation, or output form, are depicted by different, corresponding image icons, which pictorially represent the various printing conditions. For example, the print <u>icon</u> for the printer that prints 1 copy in a 2-up stapled output form is different that the print <u>icon</u> for the printer that prints 2 copies in a 2-up output form. From the above, it is clear that the specification describes a print control operation system using icons, wherein "print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon". Finally, the description in the specification makes the above even more clear when it

describes the subsequent dragging of the file icon so that it comes into contact with the print icon (see Fig. 1B and lines 19-24, p. 10). Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification portions illustrate print conditions being displayed when the file icon 12 is not located over the print icon 11. Thus, the claim is supported and the Section 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Fitzpatrick et al. (US 5,546,527) in view of Hemenway et al. (US 5,638,505) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledged that Fitzpatrick teaches all the limitations of claim 1 except the limitation that "print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon". He then resorted to Hemenway for the missing limitation.

Fitzpatrick generally discloses a technique for sending a printing command to a printer for printing a file, by dropping a dragged file icon 29 onto a print icon 23A (Fig. 2). Furthermore, when the file icon is superposed on the print icon for a predetermined amount of time (Fig. 3), a window picture for parameter setting different from default setting is displayed (Fig. 4) so that it is possible to identify/set the printing conditions.

First, claim 1 requires "a print icon having predetermined print conditions…executed under the predetermined print conditions in said print icon…a printer icon which is capable of directly designating at least one frequently used function among print processing functions possessed by the printer." Fitzpatrick (and Hemenway) fails to disclose this feature. As discussed above, in certain example embodiments of the invention, the print icon has a display of print conditions on the icon itself. No additional operation needs to be performed for the user to view the predetermined printing conditions in the print icon. For example, by seeing the print

icon corresponding to management number 2 in Fig. 8 of the present application, the user knows that the printer is set to print 2 copies in a 2-up output format. In contrast, in both Fitzpatrick and Hemenway, the icon itself lacks any printing information that is present on the icon. In Fitzpatrick, the user must hover the dragged file icon over the print icon for a certain time until a dialog box containing printing information opens up (Fig. 4). The print icon 23A itself lacks any printing information (see Figs. 2-3). Similarly, in Hemenway, the print icon itself (see icon labeled "PrintTool" on the display screen) lacks any printing information. Only by clicking on the icon a display window 46 opens up containing printing information.

In other words,, the example embodiment of the invention presented in the present application features a <u>print short-cut icon, which is a combination of print processing functions</u> selected in advance from functions carried by the printer. This feature lacks in Fitzpatrick and Hemenway, where the "functional icon" is merely an object for dragging and dropping the file icon. As to subsequent operation for how to process the data meant for the file icon which is dragged and dropped, it is so configured to be set up by opening a <u>new window</u>.

Second, claim 1 also requires "the print icon can be <u>generated</u> on a screen of the display as a printer icon which is capable of directly designating at least one frequently used function among print processing functions possessed by the printer". Fitzpatrick (and Hemenway) fails to teach or suggest this feature. In an example embodiment of the invention, the user can create a <u>new</u> print icon with desired printing conditions (see lines 16-21, p. 16). In contrast, in Fitzpatrick the icon is apparently prepared by the vendor who provided the print system, and the user cannot create new print icons (other than <u>temporarily</u> change the default settings of the <u>provided</u> print icon).

1333882

Regarding the missing limitation of "said print conditions are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form when the file icon is not located over the print icon", allegedly taught by Hemenway, it is respectfully submitted that Hemenway fails to teach said limitation. Hemenway discloses that the print conditions are displayed on a _different_ window, e.g. 46, than the print icon, e.g., "PrintTool", that is on the display screen. Said window does not open _unless_ the additional operation of double clicking on the print icon is performed. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not look into Hemenway for modifying the system of Fitzpatrick so that the print icon displays printing information when the file icon is not in contact, since in Hemenway the icon does not display any information _without any additional operation_.

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Fitzpatrick et al. (US 5,546,527) in view of Rzepkowski et al. (US 7,065,716) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner acknowledged that Fitzpatrick teaches all the limitations of claim 3 except the limitation that "wherein at a time point when a file icon of a file to be printed is superposed on said print icon, a printing preview of the file icon's associated file to be printed is displayed on said display picture." He then resorted to Rzepkowski for the missing limitation.

First, claim 3 requires "a print _icon_ having predetermined print conditions…wherein the print conditions _in_ said print _icon_ are displayed on said display picture in a recognizable display form…" Fitzpatrick fails to disclose this feature. As discussed above, the icons that are present on the display screen in Fitzpatrick's system lack any printing information related to the associated printer, see for example, Figs. 2 and 3, where the print icon is a blank icon. Only after the user performs the hovering operation by superimposing the file icon on the print icon a

- 9 -

separate <u>window</u> containing printing information appears (Fig. 4). In contrast, as discussed above, in certain example embodiments of the invention, the print <u>icon</u> has a display of print conditions <u>on the icon itself</u> (Fig. 8). No <u>additional</u> operation needs to be performed for the user to view the predetermined printing conditions in the print icon.

Regarding the missing limitation of "wherein at a time point when a file icon of a file to be printed is superposed on said print icon, a printing preview of the file icon's associated file to be printed is displayed on said display picture", allegedly taught by Rzepkowski, it is respectfully submitted that Rzepkowski fails to teach said limitation.

Rzepkowski is concerned with a completely different application compared to selecting and printing text files. Rzepkowski's method allows a user to visualize the results of generating a production <u>scan</u> of an original document using the current scan parameters without generating a preview scan (lines 23-27, col. 2). In other words, instead of actually performing a scan operation of an original document and accordingly judge whether the resulting captured image is desirable, i.e., with the desired frame, and scaling properties, the user views a preview pane portion that graphically illustrates how the various image capture parameters selected by the user will be applied to the original document to generate the captured electronic image data (lines 52-62, col. 2). For example, a preview mimic 482 (Fig. 6) may include: an image orientation mimic 488 that indicates the image orientation that will result based on the selected parameters; an image quality profile mimic 489 indicating, for example, that a "photo" image quality profile has been selected; page size mimic portion 483; crop/frame marquee 484; and a scale marquee 486 (lines 27-60, col. 12, lines 12-32, col. 13). Hence, the information appearing on the preview pane 480 includes various graphical symbols indicating the <u>parameters</u> of the scanned document. The information displayed on the preview panel does not include "a printing preview of the file

icon's associated <u>file</u>", as required by claim 3. In contrast, in an example embodiment of the present invention, a "printing preview", as called for in claim 3, is an <u>image of at least part of what is going to be printed</u> (see, for example, Figs. 7 and 11). Rzepkowski does not show such a printing preview of the file to be scanned. All that is shown is various graphical schematic symbols helping the user visualize the size, and orientation of the document to be scanned (see, for example, Fig. 6 where no information about the actual contents of the document is revealed). There is nothing in Rzepkowski that even suggests this aspect of claim 3.

In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have looked into Rzepkowski to modify the method of Fitzpatrick. Rzepkowski is concerned with <u>scanning</u> documents, as opposed to Fitzpatrick who is concerned with <u>printing</u> documents. A document to be scanned is already known to the user, who is only concerned with selecting the appropriate scanning parameters so that the scanned document has the desired size/orientation. In contrast, in a printing operation, the user wants to know the <u>contents</u> of the file before it is printed, so that he may choose to proceed with the printing or not.

For the above reasons, claims 1 and 3 are allowable.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2, 4-8, 10-11, all dependent from independent claims 1 and 3, also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

1333882

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate

allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____ /Leonidas Boutsikaris/ _____
Leonidas Boutsikaris, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100